

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

126

Remember, example is the most powerful teacher. I urge the FCC to strengthen democracy, protect our airwaves, and bring us a Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you very much.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Claire.

Tom Handel?

MR. FRANKEL: Yes. Hi. My name is Alan Frankel. I'm from Framingham, Massachusetts, and I'm going to actually address the Commissioners. At the beginning of the hearing you said it's all about us. Actually, it's all also about you. And I want to thank you, not just for coming all the way to Maine, but, in particular, Commissioners Adelstein and Copps, for what you've managed to do to preserve media diversity at a time when it was very threatened. In the period from 2003 to 2004 you understood the great threat that we were in.

It hasn't been mentioned at this hearing, but Congress actually had to step in, a bipartisan group of Congress -- of legislators, who were alarmed at the wholesale lifting of media ownership rules, and I think that's worth a mention.

When I came here, I actually wrote up a whole speech, which I've now put away, which talked about two train wrecks: One of them being in Minot, North Dakota,

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

127

and I know that some of you know about that; but briefly, a train derailed and spilled its load of anhydrous ammonia. The fumes filled the town. They wanted to put public alerts on TV and radio, but the problem was on radio, there were -- all six stations in the city were owned by Clear Channel, and no one local was running them.

Now from what I've heard in Maine, we've heard many broadcasters talk about what a wonderful place it is and how there are so many local people. It's not like that in Massachusetts. In Massachusetts you can either have local conservative talk show hosts or public radio or vanished progressive talk.

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank up, Alan. Time is up.

MR. FRANKEL: Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Tom Handel? Tom?

MR. HANDEL: Hi.

MR. ENSSLIN: You have two minutes.

MR. HANDEL: I'm Tom Handel. I'm the Executive Director of the Community Television Network, the Portland public access station here in Portland, and the regional station for the greater Portland area. Tony Vigue, our President of the Board, was on the panel and he described somewhat what our stations do.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

128

My concern is not so much that what you will do will eliminate major corporate media, but that media will get bigger and will eliminate stations like ours and more locally-owned stations. The thing is that the -- it's not really -- I'm really impressed by some of the things that I've heard that some of these nationally-owned media outlets do locally, but it's not a question of how -- that they do local programming, but how much can they do.

We have a reasonably large Cambodian community here in Portland, and you won't see a program on any of those stations that's in Khmer. We have programs on our stations specifically for that community.

They pointed out that if you do local programming, you'll get the market share. It's market driven, but there are markets that don't produce revenue, and that's where local programming really becomes important.

The other thing is who decides what goes on those stations. You do have some pretty benevolent managers and owners of stations that bring you local programming, but we have programs like Second Act which Tony mentioned that is for seniors, but by seniors, by the Southern Maine Area Agency On Aging. Seniors produce those shows, and the Maine AARP produce those shows on our stations that would never get full air time on any

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

129

other station.

We're not asking to eliminate major media outlets, but hopefully diversity of outlets, so that public access stations can thrive, locally-owned stations can thrive, and we can build social capital because we're really working on the issues that are mentioned on the -- by the major networks.

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Tom.

Now the next names I'd like to call to come down and stand in line by the microphone on that side are Donna Frisoli, Bruce Hancock, Frederick Lancaster, Dan Willett, Nathan Ross, and John Greenman, which gets us up through number 106.

And the next speaker on this side is Pete Cavanaugh.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Senator, Congressmen, Commissioners. Thanks for coming to Maine. Thanks for putting in such a long day.

Thanks to local access television, okay, the real local television, I was able, after the first panel, to run home, make dinner, eat dinner, walk the dog, and still pay attention to the proceedings, okay? So that's real local television.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

130

If you were the Maine Communications Commission, I'd say there is absolutely no problems. Everything is fine. You know, you've heard all the testimony, things are going great. We can just end the meeting, and you can all go home. Unfortunately, you're the Federal Communications Commission, and you have to consider the entire country, okay?

I have a problem with cross-ownership, and I'll describe the situation. I used to live in Manchester, New Hampshire, which the largest newspaper in the state is the Manchester Union Leader. And the State of New Hampshire only has one commercial television station, WMUR.

Now, the Manchester Union Leader used to be published by the late William Loeb, who, if you know anything about him, he makes Ann Coulter look like Katie Couric, okay? And with cross-ownership, if he had been allowed to both have the Union Leader and purchase WMUR, I'm really concerned about what the state of affairs would have been in the State that hosts the first primary in the nation. I think we would have had bad media in the State of New Hampshire. So I wish you'd give serious consideration to cross-ownership and its impact on our national politics.

Other than that, net neutrality, a real license

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

131

renewal procedure, and reinstatement of the Fairness Doctrine.

Thanks.

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Pete.

Seth Burner?

MR. BURNER: Hi. I'm Seth Burner of Portland. Out of four and a half hours set aside for public comment, three and a half hours was allocated to people working within commercial media and charity --

(Audience applause.)

-- named charities that were the beneficiaries of corporate largess. What you haven't heard is the public, and that seems particularly fitting in a discussion about media consolidation because that's exactly how media has acted for the last several years.

It has said what media wants, but not what the public wants. If it were otherwise, the discussions about what the United States is doing in the Middle East would have been taking place in 2002, not waiting until 2006 and still lagging behind in 2007.

(Audience applause.)

The fact is that consolidated media does not provide a diversity of opinion that democracy needs. There has been talk about -- and this is not just a Federal issue, because Federal issues are local issues.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

132

What people locally hear on national broadcast affects how they vote and how they act locally.

What media is not doing is talking about issues that actually affect how societies operate, how businesses operate. So there is never any discussion about tax policy which might affect how media itself operates. Media has a conflict of interest between its desire -- corporate -- commercial media has a conflict of interest between its desire to make a profit and its obligation under democracy to inform the public. And it does not carry out anything that seems to act against its own interests.

What's at stake here is democracy. You can't put it any simpler than that. It is essential to any definition of democracy that an electorate be informed, and the choice that's available now is whether media is going to inform the public and none of this rhetoric about localism that doesn't actually involve local issues; whether media is going to be held to a standard of informing the public or whether it's going to be allowed to make unbridled profits, and that's a choice that you're going to have to make, and it's a choice that you can make.

Trust can be broken up when the media become too large, like a trust, you break it up, because democracy

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

133

requires it.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thanks, Seth.

The next names I'd like to call to come down on this side by this microphone are Henry Hagenbach, Paul Cunningham, Shea Robbins, Anna-Ruth Steward, and Louise Lora Somlyo.

And the next speaker will be Jim Lohmeyer on this side. Jim, are you here?

Amy Browne?

Actually, the next speaker, then, on the right would be Robin Bergman.

MS. BERGMAN: Yeah.

MR. ENSSLIN: Okay, Robin.

MS. BERGMAN: Good evening. My name is Robin Bergman. I am here to testify from Arlington, Massachusetts.

Like happened similarly here in Maine recently, on December 21st our only Boston all-progressive talk station was suddenly canceled without warning. In Boston, which is about 70 percent liberal, there are numerous conservative talk stations, a couple of centrists programs, but no progressive talk. Does this serve our local and public interest?

I will send the Commissioners a copy of our



THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

134

petition with more than 2400 signatures and comments that illustrate that there is an enthusiastic audience and willing advertisers for progressive talk despite being told the opposite. A group of active listeners is working to get a progressive talk station back on the airwaves.

There are six large media companies who own virtually all of the stations in Boston. The few remaining privately owned are mostly on the auction block, feeling squeezed by ever-spiraling costs and being -- and fees continually being driven upward by the big corporations. Does this serve our local and public interest?

Many corporate media giants look to make sure short term profits, running stations by satellite feed from a closet at the expense of local independent programming. Does this serve our local public interest?

Progressive programming is thriving across the country where it gets a decent signal and includes local programming, if it can find an available station to carry it. A thriving democracy requires dialogue and an exchange of ideas to inform its citizenry. We the people own the airwaves, and it's time for radio to serve the local and public interest and renew its role as the fourth estate.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

135

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Robin.

George Barrett?

MR. BARRETT: Hi. I'd like to thank the FCC for coming, and welcome you to New England. I'm also a member of Robin's group that she started, and we'd just like to ask the FCC to hold a similar hearing in Boston. That would be number one.

And two, limit the number of stations and other media outlets a company can own in one market and roll back the consolidation caused by the 1996 Telecommunications Act.

Number three would be create incentives and protections to nurture more small locally-owned stations.

And four, prioritize enforcement of serving the public interest by allowing the public to be part of the process more frequently, like this. And ban repeated propaganda and false news presented as real news and fact.

A thriving democracy requires dialogue and an exchange of ideas through informed citizenry. We the people own the airwaves, and it's time for radio to serve the local public interest first.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

136

Thank you.

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you.

Rob Rosenthal?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much for being here. My name is Rob Rosenthal. I teach radio at the Salk Institute for Documentary Studies. I teach radio production at the University of Southern Maine, and I'm a freelance radio producer. It's a real privilege to be able to speak to you tonight. Thank you for being here.

We heard a great deal of information from local broadcasters about the services that they provide, and primarily it included the good work of providing PSA's for charities, fundraisers for charities, and emergency information during times of emergency. I want to thank the broadcasters for that. They left out that they also give my students tours at their radio stations.

But what I'm about to ask may get me uninvited at the next tour, and that is, is this as good as it gets? Radio stations have been regulated since 1927 in the Radio Act of 1927 to operate in the public interest. We've had 80 years to perfect operating in the public interest. Is this as good as it gets? Have we reached the pinnacle of public service in broadcasting? I don't think we have, and I want to pick one specific area with

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

137

commercial radio broadcasters, and that's with public affairs programming.

At the University of Southern Maine, when I teach students how to produce a public affairs program, I've had students ask me why are you teaching us this? Radio stations don't provide this kind of programming. Well, of course they would say that. Because when stations do -- and it isn't always that often. When they do, it's on Sunday mornings at 6 o'clock. They've ghettoized the programming when they decide to do it.

When they do do it, I've heard stations in this market, they'll play one program at 6:00 a.m., and then they take that same program and they'll move it to the next station that they own and they'll air it at 6:30, and they'll take the same program and they'll move it to 7 o'clock at another station.

(Audience applause.)

That's what you get when you have consolidation of ownership. I ask you to restore the Fairness Doctrine, issue program lists based on communities ascertainment, and to reduce the ownership level caps that you have in place.

Thank you very much.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Rob.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

138

Now, the next names I'd like to call on this side to come down to the microphone are Anne Ter Weele, Ken Orton, Richard Rhames, Roy Ghim, Liz Wright, and Scott Segee.

And the next speaker on the right is Conrad Willeman.

Seabury Lyon?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Seabury had to leave and left a note that he wanted read. I didn't know if you prefer me to read it or just submit it. It's very short.

MR. ENSSLIN: Why don't you just submit it. Have we heard from you tonight? Have you spoken?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, I have.

MR. ENSSLIN: Why don't you just, if you don't mind. We'll put it in the record.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MR. ENSSLIN: The next speaker on this microphone would be Marian Schmidt.

Charlie Remy?

MR. REMY: Yes. Charlie Remy, concerned citizen from Gorham.

Unlike so many of the people that have testified tonight, I have not been planted here by the corporate media.

(Audience applause.)

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

139

Okay. So I have some specific evidence of the failure of the corporate media to provide for the local community here in Maine. First of all, I'd like to talk about WGME, which is owned by Sinclair Broadcast Group, and their abysmal news situation, and it's gotten worse over the past year or so under new management. They will send out reporters with a speed gun in neighborhoods to find speeders. They go through the beach and pick up trash, and then call it a news story to try to get trash picked up. They are basically just an appendage of law enforcement.

When Sinclair took over that station, local weekend news was cut. We have news share agreements with the Fox and WB -- the old WB, whatever it's called now, that limit the voices. These other stations produce news without hiring any other employees. We have all these news programs, but all the content is recycled. It's nothing new because the -- because the news organizations are too cheap to hire more journalists because news costs.

And we have WCSH and WLBZ owned by Gannett, and in Bangor they only have two news programs per day, and the rest is all Portland news; and Bangor is a completely separate market. They should not be getting Portland news. So those are examples.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

140

I really commend the Blethen family that owns Portland Press Herald/Maine Sunday Telegram. I think they're a model for localism.

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Charlie.

Loretta McKinnon?

Carl Loomis? Is Loretta here or Carl Loomis?

Dave Chipman?

MR. CHIPMAN: Dave Chipman.

MR. ENSSLIN: Dave? Dave, you have two minutes.

MR. CHIPMAN: Thank you.

Low-power broadcast, Harpswell Community Television has proven time and time again that media that is locally owned and operated is both desired and important. Desired, because in Harpswell's case, the Board of Directors who oversee the operation of the television station directly represent the community and the station is directly responsive to that community; and important because Harpswell citizens not only participate in the production of programs or subject matters such as travel, science, government and nutrition, but participate in the selection and presentation of informational and entertaining programs from around the world.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

141

These are not programs that are being spoon-fed to the Harpswell citizens by corporate giants whose main interest is selling them corn flakes or purple pills, but rather programs that are being produced and/or presented to each other for pure purposes. This is not information that is presented to manipulate and control, but to enlighten and inform. Harpswell's community television is a nonprofit education institution whose only goal is to provide opportunities for communications and conversation.

Every vote cast by Harpswell's citizens is enlightened and informed, be it a local referendum questioning or national election, and Harpswell's municipal planning process is available in every living room, not simply because the town government wants it there, but because the people of Harpswell have stepped forward to make it happen.

Many of Maine's struggling singer/songwriters have an avenue for self-promotion at Harpswell Community Television. Local children learn early that what they have to say is as important as everyone else. They learn about television, how to watch responsibly, and they participate in school plays and music programs, as well as the television coverage of these events.

Does this all sound like democracy in action? Does



THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

142

it intrigue you that Harpswell voter turnout is now over 80 percent or better. Is an enlightened, enthusiastic and participatory government and citizenry what our founding fathers envisioned? Truly, without citizen control and local oversight, media is subject to abuse.

As media is taken from the hands of local owners and operators and consolidated for political purposes and monetary gain, we all lose. Regulations strive to creates diversification of ideas and points of view. And as heartwarming as some of the local stories --

MR. ENSSLIN: Dave, time is up. Thank.

MR. CHIPMAN: Geez, wow.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Donna Frisoli? Donna, you have two minutes.

MS. FRISOLI: Greetings, and thank you for deciding to hold your public hearing in Portland, Maine. I feel honored and -- to be able to offer public comment to you in person. My name is Donna Frisoli. I'm the station manager of a 501-C3 nonprofit, noncommercial, low-power public access facility also on cable, or otherwise known as PEG television.

I know the Commissioners are familiar with the acronym PEG, and I know you are aware that PEG programming is usually only found on cable TV. As a PEG

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

143

low-power TV station, we have filled a gap and met the need and continue to meet the needs of our community. We fill a niche that even other local full-power stations are not able to fill. Full-power stations often need to answer to upper management, which in some cases could cause censorship of local political voices and viewpoints, such as the Humble Farmer.

(Audience applause.)

Our low-power TV is a conduit for everyday people. We give regular people, and all of the local nonprofits in our area, hospitals, Red Cross, you name it, they've been to our station, the governor, our representatives, the opportunity to speak to their community. This means they can have their say, even if it means their say is different from outside influences with huge resources.

If you look at the offering of the major channels, it's all the same: Reality shows, game shows, talk shows, et cetera. It's reminiscent of Bruce Springsteen's lyrics, there's 100 channels with nothing on.

Local TV is not like that. When you are watching localism on TV, you are seeing your friends, your neighbors, children, and government in action. Low-power TV is local TV. And I have some comments from viewers. I want to give you a big thanks, each every --

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

144

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Donna, your time is up.

On this side, I'd like to call more names of people to come down and stand by the microphone. Greg Dismore, Ani St.Amand, Leigh Arsenault, Donna Binder, and Jeff Stevenson.

And then the next person to speak on this side is Bruce Hancock. Is Bruce here?

Frederick Lancaster?

MR. LANCASTER: Good evening, Commissioners, and friends and neighbors.

I would say, Commissioners, that you've heard a unanimous outcry for decreditation of our media. That other than the paid employees, the professionals that represent our media, you have had a unanimous call for strengthening the local ownership, the local responsibility of our media to our citizens here. I would say that our media is a deeply flawed and broken system. I'd say that if our media had done its job, we would not be in Iraq this evening. I would say that that debate would have happened on our local airwaves, and that our children and our neighbors would not be serving.

Talking about the local business angle of this, my automobile repair person today was telling me about his son serving in the 93rd Airborne this evening in Iraq.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

145

Now, that debate ought to have happened, and you five gentlemen and gentle ladies have the responsibility going forward this evening to ensure that we have a diverse ownership of other media. And I have specific examples that I'd like to ask you through [freepress.org](http://freepress.org) to limit the ownership regulations so that one company may not own more than 5 percent of the total number of AM and FM radio stations in the country. In terms of local ownership, no one entity would control more than 10 percent of the total commercial radio stations in a given market.

And finally, that the licensed broadcasters -- that the license given to broadcast outlets extend no more than three years.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Dan Willett. Dan, you have two minutes.

MR. WILLETT: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Dan Willett, and I'm testifying on behalf of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its general President, James P. Hoffa. My comments tonight focus on how corporate ownership structures can affect the fundamental FCC concerns of localism and diversity, and present opportunities for the FCC to enhance the public interest when drafting its new rules.

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

146

Concerns about broadcast, localism, and diversity have come to our attention with the recent applications by the Tribune Company to transfer ownership and seek continuation of waivers of the Commission's media cross-ownership rules. The terms of the proposed buyout, which will transfer ownership of the \$8.2 billion media conglomerate to an employee stock ownership plan, but control to one investor, underscores a growing need for the FCC to ensure protections of local and diverse viewpoints in its broadcast ownership rule making.

The Tribune change of ownership provides a unique opportunity for the FCC to consider how ownership structures affect localism and viewpoint diversity. If given a chance, Tribune employee owners could play a crucial role in enhancing localism and diversity for the benefit of public served by the Tribune.

These 21,000 individuals, some of them Teamsters, spread across the country, live and work in the areas. The Tribune's broadcast properties serve and could provide a meaningful and diverse perspective to Tribune's program and operations that would be responsive to the concerns of the local communities.

Such a perspective is particularly important when the FCC is being asked to extend the Tribune's cross-media ownership waivers. The Teamsters represent 1.4

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

147

million members, including approximately 2,000 that work for Tribune. Tens of thousands of Teamster members and retirees reside in Tribune served media markets located coast to coast --

MR. ENSSLIN: Dan, I'm afraid your time is up.

MR. WILLETT: -- well being depends on this.

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Nathan Ross? Is Nathan here?

John Greenman?

Why don't I call down more names for this left-hand side by this microphone, starting with Barton Bruce, Caroline Losneck, Gary Dixon, Andrea Mueillo, and Linda Commeau next.

The next speaker on this side will be Henry Hagenbach. Is Henry here? Henry?

MR. BRUCE: I'm Barton Bruce. Am I up?

MR. ENSSLIN: You're Bruce? You're not up. I was just calling you to come down and stand in line, but maybe the other -- if the other folks don't -- you will be next if the other people don't appear when I call their name.

Henry Hagenbach?

Paul Cunningham?

Shea Robbins?

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

148

Anna-Ruth Stewart? Anna-Ruth, are you here?

MS. STEWART: I am.

MR. ENSSLIN: Okay. Anna-Ruth, you have two minutes.

MS. STEWART: Okay. This reminds me of the small business meeting that I went to back in 1973. It was for small business owners and people that needed help, and they had this big program going on telling us or asking us what we could do, what we were doing and whatever, and the only one there from small business was me. The other ones were all CPA's, lawyers, everybody that I had to work with; and the only way they knew what my problem was, was the fact that I gathered all my business things and handed it to them.

Now, I come here tonight, and I hear everything from all the broadcasters. I don't see the people who are really concerned about what they're reading, what they're seeing, and that -- other than those that are getting the benefits of the free services.

The thing that irritates me, for one, actually this is my number one, I guess, is the fact that I turn my TV stations on after getting out of work, and everything on there is not local, local, it's a review of what's been going on all day that I've watched on cable all day.

And on the weekends, I'm not seeing anything from,

THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

149

say, Friday night, except reruns on Channel 8, and they're from Friday night, 11 o'clock. I called all three major stations because I had a wrecker driver, our family and our company, get killed in 1978, and all I've heard is from the tired truckers mothers, but when something happens to a trucker, they don't want to hear it.

I have boys that are truck drivers, and I want to hear about that. And I hope that other people will not just look at them as something bad. But thank God my wrecker driver that got killed, will --

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Anna-Ruth. Your time is up. Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Louise Lora? You have two minutes.

MS. SOMLYO: Louise Lora Somlyo. I'm speaking on behalf him Linda Commeau who had to go to work in Lewiston.

I wish to take the opportunity to express my concern regarding the lack of truth printed or aired within the police logs, judicial incarceration systems. There seems to be a bias version of these issues.

Shouldn't everyone be able to speak their experiences of these systems? There needs to be a balance, not a one-sided view. Whatever these entities



THE REPORTING GROUP  
Mason & Lockhart

150

say is supposedly the truth, and is, therefore, printed or broadcast; however, there isn't any investigation or accountability of these entities. Media prints, broadcasts these injustices with no thought to the individual person. Before false allegations are broadcast, get the other side of the story.

Michael Commeau is in jail for life because mainstream media refuses to provide an avenue of diversity. Michael Commeau's side of the story, for example. If this is accomplished, innocent people wouldn't be where they are now. For example, Michael Commeau being in prison for life.

Michael Commeau, Linda Commeau's husband, is serving a life sentence without any evidence. How can this be? Exposure of these entities need to be revealed and bring back we the people.

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you. On this microphone is Anne Ter Weele ready to speak?

Ken Orton?

Richard Rhames?

MR. RHAMES: Right here. Sorry. I'm multitasking. Yeah, I'm Richard Rhames, farmer from Biddeford. I've been a local content provider to the